



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS
Washington, D.C. 20231
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/843,462	04/25/2001	Barbara A. Foster	PC10583ADAM	8327

7590

11/04/2002

Gregg C. Benson
Pfizer Inc.
Patent Department, MS 4159
Eastern Point Road
Groton, CT 06340

EXAMINER

COOK, LISA V

ART UNIT

PAPER NUMBER

1641

DATE MAILED: 11/04/2002

8

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

09/843,462

Applicant(s)

FOSTER ET AL.

Examiner

Lisa V. Cook

Art Unit

1641

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 22 July 2002.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-23 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) 9-19 and 21-23 is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-8 and 20 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☒ Claim(s) 1-23 are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☒ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
- Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
- 11) ☐ The proposed drawing correction filed on _____ is: a) ☐ approved b) ☐ disapproved by the Examiner.
- If approved, corrected drawings are required in reply to this Office action.
- 12) ☒ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120

- 13) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.
- 14) ☒ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e) (to a provisional application).
- a) ☐ The translation of the foreign language provisional application has been received.
- 15) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 120 and/or 121.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s). _____
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 3) ☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s) 3 & 4. 6) ☐ Other: _____

DETAILED ACTION

Election/Restrictions

1. Applicants' provisional election of Group I – claims 1-8 and 20 with traverse is acknowledged. (See paper#7, filed 7/22/02). Applicant does not traverse the Restriction Requirement on the grounds of lack of patentable distinctness. The traversal on the ground(s) “that the examiner has not shown that a serious burden would be required to examine all of the claims”, is not found convincing.

This is not found persuasive because MPEP § 808.02 recites:

Where related inventions as claimed are shown to be distinct under the criteria of MPEP § 806.05(c)- § 806.05(i), the examiner, in order to establish reasons for insisting upon restriction, must show by appropriate explanation one of the following: (A) Separate classification thereof, (B) A separate status in the art when they are classified together, or (C) A different field of search.

In the instant case, (A) -The Restriction Requirement under 35 U.S.C. § 121 in Paper #6 established distinctness of the inventions and separate classification thereof:

(B) The inventions of Groups I and II would require a separate status in the art when they are classified together; the invention as a whole is drawn to methods of monitoring antibody binding to retinoblastoma protein as a measure of CDK activity. Such inventions are classified in 436, subclass 517 for example.

Art Unit: 1641

(C) With respect to a different field of search – Because these inventions are distinct and have acquired separate status in the art as shown by their different classification, recognized divergent subject matter and because the search required for each invention is not substantially coextensive with the search required for the remaining invention, restriction for examination purposes as indicated is proper. Please note that the classifications in the restriction are illustrative only and do **not** represent all the classes and subclasses, which must be searched for each invention; nor is the search limited to issued US patents, but rather includes published foreign patents and applications as well as literature search.

2. Further, the combination of Groups I and II (claims 1-23) for examination on the merits is deemed incorrect. The merging of these groups would combine patentably distinct inventions. The restriction requirement separating In the instant case the different method inventions have different modes of operation the method of Group I merely requires the formation and detection of an antibody complex comprising anti-retinoblastoma protein (Rb) capture antibody and an anti-Rb primary antibody.

While the method of Group II is directed to a screen requiring agent/test compound contact with a cell, lysing the cell, formation and detection of an antibody complex comprising anti-retinoblastoma protein (Rb) capture antibody and an anti-Rb primary antibody and comparing the agent cell to control cells not exposed to the agent. Group I does not require agent exposure, cell lysing or control comparison. Therein the methods are distinct.

The Restriction Requirement is still deemed proper and is therefore made **FINAL**.

3. Currently, claims 1-23 are subject to Restriction and Election Requirement. Claims 9-19 and 21-23 have been withdrawn from further consideration by the examiner, 37 CFR 1.142(b), as claims drawn to a non-elected invention. Claims 1-8 and 20 are currently pending and under examination.

Drawings

4. The drawings in this application are not objected to by the Draftsperson under 37 CFR 1.84 or 1.152 (see PTO-948). The draws have been stamped – Approved by Draftsman.

Information Disclosure Statement

5. The listing of references in the specification is not a proper information disclosure statement. 37 CFR 1.98(b) requires a list of all patents, publications, or other information submitted for consideration by the Office, and MPEP § 609 A(1) states, "the list may not be incorporated into the specification but must be submitted in a separate paper." Therefore, unless the examiner on form PTO-892 or applicant on PTO-1449 has cited the references they have not been considered.

6. The information disclosure statements filed in paper #3 on 5/7/01 and in paper #4 on 6/25/02 have been considered as to the first action on the merits.

Oath/Declaration

7. A new oath or declaration is required because the residence –country for each inventor is not provided. The wording of an oath or declaration cannot be amended. If the wording is not correct or if all of the required affirmations have not been made or if it has not been properly subscribed to, a new oath or declaration is required. The new oath or declaration must properly identify the application of which it is to form a part, preferably by application number and filing date in the body of the oath or declaration. See MPEP §§ 602.01 and 602.02.

Specification

8. The lengthy specification has not been checked to the extent necessary to determine the presence of all possible minor errors. Applicant's cooperation is requested in correcting any errors of which applicant may become aware in the specification.

The use of the trademarks has been noted in this application. (see - NUNC on page 7, Tween on page 8, and Pharminogen on page 12 - for examples). They should be capitalized wherever they appear and be accompanied by the generic terminology.

Although the use of trademarks is permissible in patent applications, the proprietary nature of the marks should be respected and every effort made to prevent their use in any manner, which might adversely affect their validity as trademarks.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

9. Claims 1-8 and 20 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

A. Claim 1 recites the limitation “a method for measuring cyclin-dependent kinase (CDK) activity”. However the claim merely reads on the measurement of a complex formed between the sample, an anti-retinoblastoma protein (Rb) capture antibody, and an anti-Rb primary antibody. A correlation step with respect to how CDK activity will be measured via the complex is not recited. Therein it is unclear if applicant intends to measure CDK activity or simply antibody detection of a retinoblastoma protein in a given sample. Please clarify.

B. Claim 1 step (iii) recites the limitation "CDK-phosphorylated Rb" in claim 1. There is insufficient antecedent basis for this limitation in the claim. The claim does not mention a CDK-phosphorylated Rb complex nor does it indicate that the retinoblastoma protein complex formed in step (ii) undergoes phosphorylation.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

10. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negative by the manner in which the invention was made.

This application currently names joint inventors. In considering patentability of the claims under 35 U.S.C. 103(a), the examiner presumes that the subject matter of the various claims was commonly owned at the time any inventions covered therein were made absent any evidence to the contrary. Applicant is advised of the obligation under 37 CFR 1.56 to point out the inventor and invention dates of each claim that was not commonly owned at the time a later invention was made in order for the examiner to consider the applicability of 35 U.S.C. 103(c) and potential 35 U.S.C. 102(f) or (g) prior art under 35 U.S.C. 103(a).

I. Claims 1, 4-7, and 20 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(a) as being unpatentable over Wen et al. (Journal of Immunological Methods, 169, 1994, 231-240) in view of Juan et al. (Experimental Cell Research, 239, 104-110, 1998).

Wen et al. teach an ELISA (enzyme linked immuosorbent assay) to detect p110^{RB} (retinoblastoma protein). ELISA methods are taught in the instant specification (see page 6, figure 1) A coating antibody (anti-retinoblastoma protein (Rb) capture antibody) in combination with a 3C8 monoclonal antibody (anti-Rb primary antibody) is used to measure the retinoblastoma protein. See page 235, Section 3.3

Wen et al. differ from the instant invention in not specifically teaching the correlation of retinoblastoma protein to cyclin-dependent CDK activity.

However, Juan et al. disclose a method to measure the in situ phosphorylation state of retinoblastoma protein (pRb). This is accomplished by employing dual antibodies simultaneously to detect pRb. One antibody specifically detects underphosphorylated forms of the protein ($\text{pRb}^{\text{P-}}$) and the other reacts with total (pRb^{T}). The conjugation of these anti-pRb mAbs with fluorochromes of different color, allows for multiparametered flow cytometry analysis. See page 105, 1st paragraph, 1st column. In the method human peripheral blood lymphocytes in culture are contacted with anti-pRb^T conjugated to CY-Chrome and anti-pRb^{P-} conjugated with FITC. (Please see page 105, 1st column, 2nd paragraph). The fluorescence measurement can be utilized to detect agents that target CDK4 activity or other CKDs activity in pRb phosphorylation activity.

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to measure CDK activity as taught by Juan et al. with the retinoblastoma protein detection method of Wen et al., because Juan et al. taught that assays to detect retinoblastoma proteins “could be applied for screening ...CDKs and monitoring retinoblastoma phosphorylation”. See abstract. Juan et al. also taught that the function of pRb is affected by its phosphorylation at serine and threonine residues by the cyclin-dependent kinases. Page 104, 2nd column 1st paragraph.

One having ordinary skill in the art would have been motivated to correlate CDK activity in retinoblastoma protein detection in order to more obtain information with respect to the function of the protein.

II. Claims 2-3 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Wen et al. (Journal of Immunological Methods, 169, 1994, 231-240) in view of Juan et al. (Experimental Cell Research, 239, 104-110, 1998) further in view of Watanabe et al. (Brian Research, 842, 1999, pages 342-350).

Please see Wen et al. (Journal of Immunological Methods, 169, 1994, 231-240) in view of Juan et al. (Experimental Cell Research, 239, 104-110, 1998) are set forth above.

Wen et al. in view of Juan et al. differ from the instant invention in not specifically teaching the measurement of CDK2 and CDK4 activity.

However, Watanabe et al. disclose antibodies to detect the phosphorylation of retinoblastoma protein (pRb). Applicant's Rb protein. The formed complex was further employed to measure Cdk2 and Cdk4 kinase activities. See abstract. The reference teaches that pRb contains more than 12 phosphorylation sites at serine or threonine, and is phosphorylated by cyclin-dependent kinases (Cdks) in a cell cyclin-dependent manner. Page 342, 2nd column.

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to measure Cyclin E/Cdk2 and Cyclin D/Cdk4 activity as taught by Watanabe et al. in the retinoblastoma protein detection method of Wen et al. in view of Juan et al., because Watanabe et al. taught that "recently, consensus motifs for phosphorylation by cyclin D/Cdk4 and cyclin E/Cdk2 were determined and antibodies against pRb phosphoyalted sites were prepared".... by Kitagawa et al. (page 343, 1st column, 2nd paragraph). Juan et al. further taught that "little is known about the site specific phosphorylation of pRb in vivo during the differentiation process". (page 343, 1st column, 2nd paragraph).

Art Unit: 1641

Therein one having ordinary skill in the art would have been motivated to employ the known Cyclin E/Cdk2 and Cyclin D/Cdk4 antibodies directed to known sites of the retinoblastoma protein (pRb) in order to understand cyclin dependent kinase activity (cdks) in a sample. The knowledge of site specific-antibodies enhanced sensitivity with respect to where the pRb protein is being phosphorylated, therefore none relevant sites are not evaluated giving more accurate and precise detection.

III. Claims 8 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Wen et al. (Journal of Immunological Methods, 169, 1994, 231-240) in view of Juan et al. (Experimental Cell Research, 239, 104-110, 1998) and further in view of in view of Maggio (Immunoenzyme technique I, CRC press © 1980, pages 186-187).

Please see Wen et al. in view of Juan et al. as set forth above.

Wen et al. in view of Juan et al. differ from the instant invention in not specifically teaching the detection assay in test plates/micro titer plates.

However, Maggio disclose enzyme immunoassays wherein either the antigen or antibody is immobilized onto a solid phase/test plate. The solid phase can be particles, cellulose, polyacrylamide, agarose, discs, tubes, beads, or micro plates (micro titer plates). See page 186.

Wen et al., Juan et al. and Maggio are analogous art because they are from the same field of endeavor, all three inventions teach methods immunoassay methods.

Art Unit: 1641

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to use micro titer plates as taught by Maggio in the assay method to detection retinoblastoma protein of Wen et al. in view of Juan et al. because Maggio taught that micro plates or micro titer plates "are very convenient to wash thereby reducing labor in assay procedures". Page 186, last line.

11. For reasons aforementioned, no claims are allowed.

Remarks

12. Prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to the applicant's disclosure:

Tanguay et al. (Journal of Immunology, 9/15/99, 163 (6) 3160-8) disclose that BCR-induced Rb phosphorylation is abrogated by co-cross-linking with Fc gamma R. The activation of Cdk4 and Cdk2 dependent Rb protein kinase is blocked.

13. Papers related to this application may be submitted to Group 1600 by facsimile transmission. Papers should be faxed to Group 1600 via the PTO Fax Center located in Crystal Mall 1. The faxing of such papers must conform to the notice published in the Official Gazette, 1096 OG 30 (November 15, 1989). The Group 1641 Fax number is (703) 308-4242, which is able to receive transmissions 24 hours/day, 7 days/week.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Lisa V. Cook whose telephone number is (703) 305-0808. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Friday from 8:00 AM - 4:30 PM.

Art Unit: 1641

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Long Le, can be reached on (703) 305-3399.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application should be directed to the Group receptionist whose telephone number is (703) 308-0196.



Lisa V. Cook

CM1-7B17

(703) 305-0808

10/29/02



CHRISTOPHER L. CHIN
PRIMARY EXAMINER
GROUP ~~1800~~/641